

## INTRODUCTION

Marked inequality in living standards is a repetitive feature of the American city. The most obvious spatial manifestation is to be found in the low levels of living in the inner city, compared with the affluent suburbs. Inner-city poverty or social deprivation is traditionally associated with the so-called black ghetto, the persistence of which is widely recognized as an affront to social justice. While a general reduction of inequality does not figure prominently in American political rhetoric, the elimination of ghetto poverty and the improvement of the quality of life for blacks has been a widely espoused national aspiration since the civil rights movement of the 1950s. Indeed, during the 1960s the problems of the black ghetto emerged as a leading domestic priority espoused by the political and academic establishment.

The removal of the ghetto and the integration of the black population into the "mainstream" of American life could be expected to change the spatial expression of inequality in the American city in significant respects. With the areas of worst housing and social deprivation gone, intra-city differences in levels of living would obviously be reduced. Two features of the 1960s might lend support to such an expectation: the urban renewal programmes responsible for the physical elimination of poor housing, and the capacity of a prosperous economy to provide opportunities for upward mobility to increasing numbers of blacks. A plausible set of hypotheses might therefore be that inequality between the races has been reduced and that this is reflected in a reduction in inequality among residential areas within the city - themselves subject to greater racial integration.

However, what has actually happened could be rather more complicated with some perverse distributive outcomes. The physical destruction of the ghetto may not have been accompanied by the rehousing of all those displaced, their poverty may simply have been relocated. The whites may have enjoyed economic advancement, in aggregate, to the same extent as blacks, or even at a more rapid rate, thus perpetuating or exacerbating inter-racial inequality. Upward mobility within the black groups may have been highly selective. And there is no guarantee that, whatever else has occurred, deep-seated racial prejudice will have been overcome to the extent that residential integration will have increased. Thus an alternative set of hypotheses might be that inequality between the races has not been reduced, that the predominantly black areas might display the same or even greater inequality than before, that overall

inequality among residential areas might have increased rather than decreased, and that racial residential polarization remains much as before.

The purpose of this paper is to explore trends in race and space inequality in one American city, during the decade 1960 to 1970. The city in question is Atlanta, Georgia. The time period chosen covers some important changes in the social geography of the city, arising from major urban renewal projects and some expansion of black residential space. The intention is to describe these changes, as a preliminary to testing some of the hypotheses outlined above. These findings will then be related to an interpretation of the process of change in Atlanta, over the period under review.

The data base is derived from the Census of Population and Housing, for 1960 and 1970. The analysis presented here is the first stage of a project that it is hoped will subsequently use the results of the 1980 Census to extend the examination of trends in inequality in Atlanta over a further ten-year period.

The choice of the city of Atlanta is explained fully in the body of the paper. However, it is worth mentioning at the outset that Atlanta has achieved a special identity in recent years - as boom city of the "new" prosperous South, as home of Martin Luther King and other prominent black leaders, as the first major southern city to elect a black mayor, and as the political power base from which Jimmy Carter projected himself into the Presidency of the United States. What is perhaps more important to the specific focus of this paper is that, unlike northern cities with their more recent influx of blacks, Atlanta has a long-established black population with its own institutions and a "middle-class" that goes back three or four generations. With the importance of Atlanta in the civil rights movement and black political emancipation, these conditions might be regarded as particularly favourable for black economic and social advancement, once the rigid segregation and overt discrimination of the old South had been overcome. In other words, if blacks cannot "make out" in Atlanta, they are not likely to do so anywhere else in America. And if the prosperity and urban reconstruction of the 1960s did not create a more equal city in Atlanta, then the prospects of this happening elsewhere are rather remote. While no scientific claim can be made that this case study is representative of broader experience, what has been observed in Atlanta might well provide a pointer towards likely trends in intra-city differentiation elsewhere as the American metropolis emerges from a quarter of a century of change in the economic status and residential arrangement of its black population.

## BACKGROUND

Atlanta is the major commercial centre for the south-eastern corner of the United States. Devastated in the Civil War, the city was quickly rebuilt, in a spirit of growth-oriented civic enterprise that still characterizes Atlanta today, and which is popularly viewed as symbolic of the economic rise of the South. Atlanta has always been more of a regional service centre than an industrial city, with offices of banks, utilities and other corporations added to those of old-established Atlanta concerns - the most notable being the Coca Cola Company. With the central business district dominated by expensive new hotels and convention facilities, its monorail rapid transit system nearing completion, its suburban office parks and well-to-do residential areas, Atlanta presents the physical expression of the prosperity and modernity commonly associated with the "new" South and with the growing prominence of the southern "sunbelt" in the spatial pattern of America's economic growth.

But there is another side to Atlanta, of course. Its most conspicuous physical expression is the inner-city area of housing dilapidation and poverty largely surrounding the C.B.D., partially cleared and patchily reconstructed during two decades of "urban renewal" but still today a stark contrast with the concrete-and-glass glitter of the nearby office blocks and luxury hotels. While by no means all the poverty areas are occupied by blacks, it was within the black community that the most serious social deprivation was to be found during the 1960s. Atlanta was an early centre of the civil rights movement, under the leadership of the Rev. Martin Luther King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The city also threw up its own embodiment of white backlash in Lester Maddox, whose refusal to integrate his fried chicken restaurant attracted enough attention and sympathy to win him election as Governor of Georgia. The civil rights struggle and the response of the white supremacists in the form of the Ku Klux Klan, waged against the background of unprecedented if highly selective prosperity, civic boosterism, personal greed, sharp business practice and political chicanery, is an essential part of the context of social and spatial change in Atlanta during the 1960s. All this is vividly described in a recent novel by Machlin (1979).

At the time of the Civil War the population of Atlanta was 15,000. A century later, the 1970 Census recorded 1,387,600 people in the Atlanta Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, composed of the counties of Clayton, Cobb, Dekalb, Fulton and Gwinnett (Figure 1). The population

of the Central City, with which this study is concerned, was 497,000, or 35.8 of the total for the S.M.S.A. The area shown as the Urban Fringe in Figure 1 had a population of 676,000, most of this being in suburban areas immediately beyond the city limits. An important contributor to Atlanta's recent growth has been inward migration, not only of highly mobile professional and skilled workers but also of poor people displaced by the mechanization of agriculture and by economic decline in the Southern Appalachians.

Since 1970 the S.M.S.A. population has risen by an average of 31,400 a year, to give a 1978 figure of almost 1,650,000 according to the Atlanta Regional Planning Commission. However, the Central City has been losing population at the rate of about 1 per cent a year since it reached its peak towards the end of the 1960s - largely the result of white moves to the outer suburbs.

Atlanta reveals most of the economic and social problems usually identified with the contemporary American metropolis. But it has its own special features, including extremely high crime rates - especially for homicide. Some of the broader background to this is described by Hartshorn et al (1976, 53) as follows:

Most of these murders occur outside the downtown in a band of lower income black neighborhoods bordering the C.B.D., and are predominantly the result of domestic squabbles and friction among acquaintances. The southern tradition of taking the law into one's own hands, the mystique of protecting one's "honor", the everpresent distrust of the police among blacks, the abundance of handguns, the use of alcohol, and under-employment are other factors associated with violent crime in Atlanta. Low paying menial blue collar service jobs, offering little advancement potential or satisfaction, are the only occupations open to unskilled blacks. High job absenteeism and turnover rates are commonplace and run deep in inner city neighborhoods. Poverty, overcrowded homes, the high frequency of female-headed households, and the lack of child supervision frequently pervade these high crime areas. In short, social disorganization prevails.

The racial dimension of deprivation is underlined by a U.S. Bureau of Census estimate of 48.8 per cent of black families in the central city living below the poverty level in 1970, compared with only 8 per cent for whites (Clarke, 1971, 1). Conditions revealed by a survey of inner-city residents in 1965, in the middle of the period under review in this paper, are summarized as follows (Clarke, 1971, 15):

The black family is more likely than the white families of the same income level to be headed by a woman, less likely to be on welfare, more likely to be in debt, more likely to live in a neighborhood with dirty streets, with substandard housing, with noisy surroundings, with rats, with lack of recreational facilities, with overcrowded homes,

and with general squalor

...

In spite of these poor surroundings, there was no difference as regards concern about health, or children retarded in school, or children in trouble with the police between the various racial-income groups. Apathy about health, educational retardation, and delinquency, do not seem particularly related to any particular race and income group ..

In other words, the relative deprivation of poor blacks could not be attributed to their attitudes. Experience in the civil rights movement in fact made poor blacks more likely than poor whites to organize and articulate concern, though there are impediments to cohesive social movements among blacks - as will be shown later in this paper

Atlanta also has problems arising from its spatial and built form. To quote Hartshorn et al again

Many pressing problems in Atlanta are due to the rapid rate of growth and the strains of adjusting to it. Among these are excessive governmental fragmentation, spot zoning, the lack of comprehensive planning and aberrations in the housing market. The large number of governmental jurisdictions in the area has led to extremely variable tax rates. The city of Atlanta provides many services to unincorporated bedroom communities, areas which many feel are not 'paying their way' and hence being subsidized by poorer city residents

Such problems are shared by most major American cities, but they are exacerbated in the situation of substantial population growth and spatial rearrangement which has been Atlanta's recent experience.

Two aspects of population change are of particular relevance to the analysis of trends in inequality. These are the redistribution of population within the city, and the shifting racial residential pattern. The most important features may be described briefly, with the assistance of maps illustrating changes from 1960 to 1970 revealed by Census data, and also the subsequent trends up to 1978 indicated by the population estimates of the Atlanta Regional Commission. The territorial units of observation are the 102 census tracts (or combinations thereof) that form the framework for the examination of inequality later in this paper

Between 1960 and 1970 the total population of the City of Atlanta increased slightly - from 488,350 to 496,975. The pattern of population change within the city (Figure 2) shows marked contrasts, however. The relatively rapid growth of the western suburbs shows up, with less spectacular growth in the north. The inner parts of the city, around the C.B.D (somewhat off-centre in an easterly direction) reveal almost

unrelieved population decrease, with some very high rates locally where urban renewal or slum clearance had its greatest impact. During the 1970-78 period, in which there has been an overall net loss of city population, increases have been largely confined to a few suburban tracts, mainly in the west and south, with the most rapid growth now transferred across the city limits into the newer suburbs. Large proportional decreases are still registered in some inner-city tracts, although the pace of slum clearance has slackened.

The changing racial geography of Atlanta must be described in some detail, as this is fundamental to the central issue of inequality. Like other southern cities, Atlanta has a long history of racial residential segregation. Far from being reduced by the upward mobility of blacks and the integration rhetoric of the civil rights struggle, the level of segregation was, in the 1960s, as great if not greater than ever. Taeuber and Taeuber (1965, 40) show increases in their index of residential segregation in Atlanta between 1940 and 1950, and between 1950 and 1960. This was due in part to the elimination of scattered pockets of black residences, including many "rear" and "alley" dwellings, originally occupied by servants working in nearby homes of whites (Stone, 1976, 47; Hartshorn et al, 1976, 47-8). But it also reflected the preservation of racial homogeneity on a neighbourhood basis, even among the relatively well-to-do.

The degree of racial residential polarity in 1960, 1970 and 1978 is illustrated graphically in Figure 3. The vast majority of census tracts in Atlanta have continued to be occupied predominantly by one race. The only obvious difference between the three histograms is the reduction in the number of tracts with over 90 per cent of the population white and a corresponding increase in those with over 90 per cent black, which simply represents the rising share of blacks in the overall city population. The shifting racial geography of this period makes comparison with the Taeubers' index hazardous. However, the number of tracts (out of 102) with 90 per cent or less of their population accounted for by one race (i.e. "mixed" tracts, though not necessarily integrated on a street-by-street basis) was virtually the same in 1960 and 1970: 28 against 27. By 1978 it had risen to 37, reflecting the pace of change in racial geography, especially in the southern half of the city (see below), where a number of "mixed" tracts were in an active process of transition from white to black.

The process of race-residential change in Atlanta is of very great interest in its own right, reflecting important features of the

contemporary dynamics of the American city. The events of the past thirty years have been described in detail elsewhere (Glazer and McEntire, 1960, 14-51, Bederman, 1973, Owenshaw, 1973, Hartshorn et al. 1976, 46-50, Stone, 1976), a summary is all that is required here, with the latest available figures to bring the story up to date.

In 1920 there were already 60,000 blacks living in Atlanta, and this figure grew steadily during the inter-war period. By 1950 the city's population was 41 per cent black, but they were confined to what Hartshorn et al (1976, 46) describe as 'carefully prescribed so-called ghetto areas' around the western, eastern and southern fringes of the C B D (see map in Taeuber and Taeuber, 1966, 270). There had been few distributional changes since 1930, and the expansion of the black population was creating increased pressure for outward extension of the black residential areas, especially on the part of blacks with effective demand for better housing. Whites were moving out of the city, and it took a major annexation of predominantly white suburbs (which tripled the area of the city in 1952) to maintain white-numerical supremacy. The incorporation of large areas to the north, west and south of the original (pre-1952) city limits raised the issue of where the extension of black residential space might be permitted, bearing in mind that this would be strongly resisted in existing white suburbs. Some black housing had already been built in the 1930s and 1940s beyond the original western city limits, and it was in this direction that black expansion took place. At the end of the 1940s blacks occupied the Mozley Park area just inside the city limits, as part of a 'gentlemen's agreement' worked out with city officials whereby blacks would not move into white residential areas south of a certain line (Westview Drive). In the 1950s blacks moved still further west, occupying the white "middle-class" neighbourhood of Collier Heights which was part of the 1952 annexation. The pattern of westward expansion is evident in the racial composition of census tract populations in 1960 (Figure 3).

In 1960 the act of one individual precipitated what has subsequently become a fundamental change in the racial residential geography of Atlanta. A black physician moved into the white 'upper middle class' subdivision of Payton Forest, south of the Westview Drive divide. The city government tried a number of measures to prevent further black penetration, including the symbolic construction of a barricade across the street (Payton Road) leading southwards from Westview Drive. But the city ordinance enacted to legalize the closing of the street was challenged in court, the barricade was removed in 1963, and well-to-do blacks moved in substantial numbers into previously exclusively affluent white neighbourhoods. The white

exodus, provoked by the first black incursions and encouraged by the dubious practices of real-estate salesmen (black as well as white), was so rapid as to enable extensive areas to be transferred from solid white to virtually solid black in less than a decade. The impact is evident in the map for 1970 (Figure 3), which shows the consolidation of the westward wedge of black residential space. A less prominent wedge was also emerging on the eastern side of the city. The celebrated "sector model" of urban residential structure associated with Homer Hoyt accurately describes the pattern of racial differentiation in Atlanta in 1970.

Subsequent changes have been no less dramatic than those of the 1960s. The map for 1978 (Figure 3) shows that the western black wedge is extending southwards, and that a number of previously white tracts to the south of the old inner-city ghetto are now in a state of transition. Given the speed with which the transfer of residential space from whites to blacks can take place, the prospect for the 1980s is of the consolidation of black occupation of the southern part of the city, leaving the northern part still exclusively in the hands of whites. This represents the final stage of the break-out of blacks from the old ghetto into suburbia, within the constraints imposed by the preservation of some pattern of race residential segregation.

The significance of recent shifts in population is summarized in a consultants' report as follows: "The result of these trends is the increasing division of Atlanta society into black and white, rich and poor communities more segregated physically, socially and economically than in the previous 25 years" (Policy Design Corporation, 1975, 56). The remainder of this study seeks to examine this assertion and its implications for inequality in Atlanta, by establishing some basic facts and then offering an interpretation of the process involved.



## SELECTION OF INDICATORS

To establish the facts with respect to inequality in Atlanta requires a selection of social indicators. These must be capable of measuring the level of inequality at the chosen datum points of 1960 and 1970, so as to provide a reading on how far inequality has decreased or increased. Ideally, the indicators should be numerous enough to reflect a variety of attributes associated with the broad concepts of living standards or social well-being. The development of intra-city social indicators has been a focus of considerable research in human geography over the past decade (see Smith, 1973, Chapters 3, 8, Smith, 1977, Chapter 10, Smith, 1979, Chapter 4), but such studies are almost invariably static rather than dynamic. The emphasis on change in this present study acts as a constraint on the choice of indicators.

The starting point for this exercise is a piece of research by Bederman (1974), which provides a differentiation of "quality of life" in Atlanta at the level of the Census tract. Bederman identified five "factors" or general headings, under which eleven individual indicators were selected (Table 1). Data for these variables were used to generate a composite "Quality of Life Index" by a method similar to the summation of standard deviates commonly used in social indicators research (see Bederman, 1974, 30-31). The index was calculated for all but three of the 115 census tracts wholly within the city of Atlanta in 1970. Bederman's map (reproduced as Figure 4) reveals a distinct pattern. This corresponds closely with the pattern of racial residence (see Figure 3) the predominantly black areas generally have relatively low life quality, as measured by Bederman's index.

The initial intention of the present research was to replicate Bederman's work for 1960 (and, subsequently, for 1980), at least to the extent of examining changes revealed by each of Bederman's indicators. As Table 1 shows, Bederman went beyond the obvious census measures, to include infant mortality and rates of criminal activity. However, it proved impossible to compile 1960 data for the non-census variables, because of the absence of the required records in the County Health Department and the City Police Department. Attempts to obtain 1960 and 1970 data for other non-census conditions (e.g. the tuberculosis rate) also failed for similar reasons of incomplete or inadequate records. The study is thus confined to census data, as the only source that permits the identification of change at the required level of territorial disaggregation.

In the final selection of indicators, median rent, families with a female head, population 15 and under or 65 and over, and population density were dropped from Bederman's list. The first had enough tracts in 1960 with no values to render the measurement of change dubious (in any event, rentals are highly correlated with the value of owner-occupied housing units:  $r = .691$  in 1970), the second was not available for 1960, while the third and fourth are difficult to interpret. One variable not used by Bederman was added: median school years completed. The five chosen indicators are listed in Table 2, along with their extreme values to give some impression of the ranges along which the individual tracts are distributed.

While census tracts are not ideal territorial units of observation, there is no alternative in this type of analysis. Although they differ considerably in size and shape, as the maps reveal, they are designed to be relatively homogeneous with respect to the economic and social characteristics of their populations. Tracts are also defined to avoid large discrepancies of total population: in 1960 the tract populations as used in this study ranged from 1308 to 10,071, with a standard deviation of 1816 about the mean of 4717; for 1970 the statistics were a minimum of 754, maximum of 19,580, a standard deviation of 3087 and a mean of 4806. Nevertheless, most of the well-known difficulties of working with such population aggregates do arise, including the problem of the so-called ecological fallacy, which limits what the data may legitimately yield.

Four tracts have been omitted because of incomplete or otherwise misleading data. A few tracts have been amalgamated to facilitate the comparison between 1960 and 1970. Fortunately, tract definitions changed very little from the one census to the other (and have also been little altered for the 1980 census), which, along with the stability of definition of the variables themselves, makes temporal comparison much easier than would otherwise be the case.

Table 1. Variables used in Bederman's Quality of Life Index

Health Factor

Infant Mortality (1968, 1969, 1970 average)

Public Order Factor

Aggravated Assaults per 1000 People

Burglaries per 1000 Housing Units

Housing Quality Factor

% of Housing Units Lacking All or Some Plumbing

Median Value of Specified Owner Occupied Housing Units

Median Rent of Specified Renter Occupied Units

Socioeconomic Factor

Median Family Income

% of Families with Female as Head

% of Total Population 15 Years and Under and 65 Years and Older

Density Factor

Population Density per Acre

% of Occupied Units in Which the Average Room Occupance is  
Greater than 1.0

---

Source Bederman (1974, 30)



```

0014 WRITE (2,200)
0015 FORMAT (1H1,5X,'LISTING OF ATLANTA DATA FOR ')
0016 WRITE (2,201)
0017 DO 10 J = 1,47
0018 10 WRITE (2,202) ID(J), (A(I,J),M=1,5)
0019 202 FORMAT (6X,14,5(5X,F7.1))
0020 WRITE (2,200)
0021 WRITE (2,201)
0022 DO 15 J = 48,102
0023 15 WRITE (2,202) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=1,5)
0024 C
0025 WRITE (2,200)
0026 WRITE (2,201)
0027 DO 20 J = 1,47
0028 20 WRITE (2,203) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=6,11)
0029 203 FORMAT (6X,14,6(5X,F7.1))
0030 WRITE (2,200)
0031 WRITE (2,201)
0032 DO 25 J = 48,102
0033 25 WRITE (2,203) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=6,11)
0034 C
0035 WRITE (2,200)
0036 WRITE (2,201)
0037 DO 30 J = 1,47
0038 30 WRITE (2,205) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=12,16)
0039 205 FORMAT (6X,14,5(5X,F7.1))
0040 WRITE (2,200)
0041 WRITE (2,201)
0042 DO 35 J = 48,102
0043 35 WRITE (2,205) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=12,16)
0044 C
0045 WRITE (2,200)
0046 WRITE (2,201)
0047 DO 40 J = 1,47
0048 40 WRITE (2,206) ID(J), (A(I,J),M=17,22)
0049 206 FORMAT (6X,14,6(5X,F5.1))
0050 WRITE (2,200)
0051 WRITE (2,201)
0052 DO 45 J = 48,102
0053 45 WRITE (2,206) ID(J), (A(I,J),M=17,22)
0054 C
0055 WRITE (2,200)
0056 WRITE (2,201)
0057 DO 50 J = 1,47
0058 50 WRITE (2,207) ID(J), (A(I,J),M=23,27)
0059 207 FORMAT (6X,14,5(5X,F7.1))
0060 WRITE (2,200)
0061 WRITE (2,201)
0062 DO 55 J = 48,102
0063 55 WRITE (2,207) ID(J), (A(I,J),M=23,27)
0064 C
0065 WRITE (2,200)
0066 WRITE (2,201)
0067 DO 60 J = 1,47
0068 60 WRITE (2,208) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=28,32)
0069 208 FORMAT (6X,14,5(5X,F8.1))
0070 WRITE (2,200)
0071 WRITE (2,201)
0072 DO 65 J = 48,102
0073 65 WRITE (2,208) ID(J), (A(M,J),M=28,32)
0074 STOP OK
0075 END
0076

```

END OF SEGMENT, LENGTH 493, NAME TIDY

0077 FINISH

END OF COMPILATION - NO ERRORS

S/C SUBFILE: 13 BUCKETS USED

CONSOLIDATED BY XPCK 12F DATE 19/06/80 TIME 19/31/22

PROGRAM TIDY  
 EXTENDED DATA (22AN)  
 COMPACT PROGRAM (DB1)  
 CORE 10048

SEG TIDY





⑥

7

⑧

9

10

①

1960



56  
54  
53  
52  
51  
50  
49  
48  
47  
46  
45  
44  
43  
42  
41  
40  
39  
38  
37  
36  
35  
34  
33  
32  
31  
30  
29  
28  
27  
26  
25  
24  
23  
22  
21  
20  
19  
18  
17  
16  
15  
14  
13  
12  
11  
10  
9  
8  
7  
6  
5  
4  
3  
2  
1

②

1960

#5 (median rent)  
9 = MISSING  
VALUE

















LISTING OF ATLANTA DATA FOR SSRC

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

[illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100

257	0
258	0
259	0
260	0
261	0
262	0
263	0
264	0
265	0
266	0
267	0
268	0
269	0
270	0
271	0
272	0
273	0
274	0
275	0
276	0
277	0
278	0
279	0
280	0
281	0
282	0
283	0
284	0
285	0
286	0
287	0
288	0
289	0
290	0
291	0
292	0
293	0
294	0
295	0
296	0
297	0
298	0
299	0
300	0
301	0
302	0
303	0
304	0
305	0
306	0
307	0
308	0
309	0
310	0
311	0
312	0
313	0
314	0
315	0
316	0
317	0
318	0
319	0
320	0
321	0
322	0
323	0
324	0
325	0
326	0
327	0
328	0
329	0
330	0
331	0
332	0
333	0
334	0
335	0
336	0
337	0
338	0
339	0
340	0
341	0
342	0
343	0
344	0
345	0
346	0
347	0
348	0
349	0
350	0
351	0
352	0
353	0
354	0
355	0
356	0
357	0
358	0
359	0
360	0
361	0
362	0
363	0
364	0
365	0
366	0
367	0
368	0
369	0
370	0
371	0
372	0
373	0
374	0
375	0
376	0
377	0
378	0
379	0
380	0
381	0
382	0
383	0
384	0
385	0
386	0
387	0
388	0
389	0
390	0
391	0
392	0
393	0
394	0
395	0
396	0
397	0
398	0
399	0
400	0
401	0
402	0
403	0
404	0
405	0
406	0
407	0
408	0
409	0
410	0
411	0
412	0
413	0
414	0
415	0
416	0
417	0
418	0
419	0
420	0
421	0
422	0
423	0
424	0
425	0
426	0
427	0
428	0
429	0
430	0
431	0
432	0
433	0
434	0
435	0
436	0
437	0
438	0
439	0
440	0
441	0
442	0
443	0
444	0
445	0
446	0
447	0
448	0
449	0
450	0
451	0
452	0
453	0
454	0
455	0
456	0
457	0
458	0
459	0
460	0
461	0
462	0
463	0
464	0
465	0
466	0
467	0
468	0
469	0
470	0
471	0
4	

[illegible][illegible]

19/31/29	0#GEOL	2368	
19/30/30	0#QJOB	#GFOL	
14/31/30	0#QJOB	2304	
19/31/43	0#QJOB	DISP	LISTERB ---H :- GE02JOB FOR UGFA037
19/31/44	0#QJOB	DLTD	
19/31/51	0#QJOB	18240	
19/30/52	0#XFAT	#QJOB	
19/30/52	0#XFAT	18176	
19/31/19	0#XFAT	DLTD	FI #XPCK
19/31/22	0#XFAT	11456	
19/31/22	0#XPCK	#XFAT	
19/31/22	0#XPCK	11392	
19/31/30	0#TIDY	#XPCK	
19/31/32	0#TIDY	10048	
19/31/32	0#TIDY	HALT	LD
19/32/19	0#TIDY	DISP	OK
19/32/19	0#TIDY	DLTD	00
19/32/19	0#TIDY	CLKD	11

ACCOUNT CODE	UGFAC37	DATE	19/06/80	TOTAL MILL TIME	16
JOB NAME	LISTERB ---M	START TIME	19/30/23	INPUT RECORDS	388
USER NAME	GOODYEAR	END TIME	19/32/19	OUTPUT RECORDS	825
PERIPHERALS USED:				MAX. CORE SIZE	18240

FORMULA TIME            0.46 UNITS            RATION USED            0.00 UNITS

[illegible]